



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,266	12/04/2001	Masaaki Isozu	09792909-5283	2060

26263 7590 11/21/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

DOAN, DUYEN MY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/006,266	Applicant(s) ISOZU ET AL.	
	Examiner Duyen M. Doan	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detail Action

Claims 1-20 are amended for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagavath et al (us pat 6,647,001) (hereinafter Bhagavath) in view of Samadi et al (us pat 5,664,007) (hereinafter Samadi).

As regarding claim 1, Bhagavath disclosed session control means for controlling a session status of a data communication session on a first of the plurality of control terminals in which data associated with the session is received from the external network, and for controlling access to the session in accordance with a processing request received from one of the control terminals (col.6, lines 53-67; col.7, lines 1-3; col.8, lines 12-52); address conversion means for converting a destination address of data associated with the session (col.7, lines 53-67; col.8, lines 12-52; col.9, lines 1-20); and output an address rewrite processing request to said address conversion means, and said address conversion means rewrites the destination address of the data associated with the session based on the address rewrite processing request from said session control means (col.6, lines 53-67; col.7, lines 1-3, lines 53-67; col.8, lines 12-52). Bhagavath did not expressly disclose when the processing request is a resume request, said session control

Art Unit: 2143

means rewrite the session status in accordance with the resume request from said one control terminal,

Samadi taught when the processing request is a resume request, said session control means rewrite the session status in accordance with the resume request from said one control terminal (col.3, lines 58-67; col.4, lines 1-44).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Samadi to the method of Bhagavath to rewrite the session status in accordance with the resume request because both Samadi and Bhagavath taught inventions about continuing or maintaining the communication through address change.

It would have been motivated to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Samadi to the method of Bhagavath to change the session status in accordance to the resume request because by changing the session status when receive a resume request would provide continuity of common services for the duration of a call and permit ongoing call to continue (see Samadi col.1, lines 45-54).

As regarding claim 2, Bhagavath-Samadi taught wherein the processing request is a pause request from said first control terminal and said session control means temporarily stops the relay of data associated with the data communication session on said first control terminal based on the pause request from said first control terminal (See Samadi Figure.1, step 109, col.3, lines 61-67 to col.4, lines 1-10). The motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 2.

As regarding claim 3, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed wherein the resume request includes a session identifier (see Samadi col.3, lines 58-67; col.4, lines 1-44) and said session control

Art Unit: 2143

means output the address rewrite processing request in accordance with the session identifier so that said address conversion means rewrites the destination address of the data associated with the session designated by the session identifier (see Bhagavath, col.6, lines 53-67; col.7, lines 1-3; col.8, lines 12-52). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 3.

As regarding claim 4, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed wherein when the processing request is a list request, said session control means outputs a list to said one control terminal the list identifying each data communication session having a session status controller by the session control means and that the one control terminal is able to selectively access (see Samadi col.3, lines 58-67; col.4, lines 1-44, col.6, lines 15-33; col.9, lines 1-16). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 4.

As regarding claim 5, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed when the processing request is a call request fro the first control terminal, said session control means outputs a list to a destination terminal contained in the call request the list identifying each session on the first control terminal that the one control terminal is able to selectively access (see Samadi col.3, lines 58-67; col.4, lines 1-44, col.6, lines 15-33; col.9, lines 1-16). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 5.

As regarding claim 6, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed copy processing or cache processing of relay data in said communications relay device is executed in response to the processing request being a pause request request from said first control terminal (see Bhagavath col.8, lines 12-42; col.9, lines 1-20).

Art Unit: 2143

As regarding claim 7, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed a session control table that matches the session status with a session identifier corresponding to the session on said first control terminal, and wherein said session control means controls the session status based on said session control table, and rewrite the session status when the processing request is one of a pause request and a resume request (see Samadi col.3, lines 58-67; col.4, lines 1-44, col.6, lines 15-33; col.9, lines 1-67). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 7.

As regarding claim 8, Bhagavath-Samadi disclosed session control table includes a destination address and a source address corresponding to said session identifier (see Samadi col.6, lines 53-67; col.7, lines 1-3, lines 53-67; col.8, lines 12-52). The same motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 8.

As regarding claims 9-14 the limitations are similar to claims 1-8, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-8.

As regarding claims 15-19 the limitations are similar to claims 1-8, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 1-8.

As regarding claim 20, the limitations are similar to claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100